

REMARKS

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 3-24 and 28-35 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 17, 21, and 33 are amended herein.

II. Summary of the Office Action and this Reply

Claims 1, 3-7 and 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,112,239 to Kenner et al. ("Kenner"). Claims 8-10 stand rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kenner in view of Airth, "Navigation in Pop-up Menus." Claims 11-14 stand rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kenner in view of Airth, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,706,502 to Foley et al. ("Foley"). Claims 17-24 and 28-35 stand rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kenner in view of Foley.

III. Discussion of the Cited Art

U.S. Patent No. 6,112,239 to Kenner

Kenner discloses a system and method for storage and retrieval of data that involves the use of multiple delivery sites (mirror sites) throughout a network. Each delivery site (server) maintains a copy of certain files. Accordingly, each file is stored redundantly at multiple delivery sites within the network.

A particular user's request for a certain file could be serviced by any of the delivery sites storing that file. Based on the particular user's address, requested files are delivered from a particular one of the delivery sites, namely a delivery site that is "electronically close" or otherwise preferable for delivering the requested file. Kenner, Abstract; col. 5, lines 6-26; col. 6, lines 16-29.

A preferred delivery site is selected for a particular user as part of a configuration process. The preferred delivery site is then used for that user for retrieval of all files managed by the delivery system service provider. Consequently, when the user is browsing Web content, and finds a particular file managed by the system, the client software will automatically retrieve it from the specified delivery

site. Any selection of a delivery site occurs automatically and is transparent to the user. Kenner, col 5, lines 36-43; col. 5, line 61 - col. 6, line 1; col. 6, lines 36-39.

If a player program 36 at the user terminal 12 (Fig. 1) determines that a certain requested file is managed by the system, then the player program 36 creates a new electronic address/URL that includes the IP address of the previously selected delivery (mirror) site, plus certain path information, plus the name of the content provider and the filename, both of which are taken from the HTML file (EMBED statement) that was interpretable to display a link to the requested file. Col. 15, lines 19-28. Accordingly, an electronic address for requesting the file is created on-the-fly, and is not stored in the file interpretable to display a link to the file.

U.S. Patent No. 5,706,502 to Foley

Foley discloses an Internet-enabled portfolio manager system and method for portfolios of software projects that are distributed over a set of networked computers. Foley discloses a browser employed by the system to download selected remote portfolio files from the Internet. The downloading occurs as those selected portfolio files are needed by various portfolio methods as they process portfolios. Foley, col. 2, line 44 - col. 3, line 3.

Airth document

This document describes a study investigating where a pop-up menu should appear relative to the mouse pointer's position when the pop-up menu appears.

IV. Response to 103 Rejections

In paragraphs 5-9 of the Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-24 and 28-35 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a).

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to

D

combine reference teachings. Additionally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2143.

Claims 1, 3-7 and 15-16

A traditional hyperlink (displayed by the browser) is associated with a single electronic address (e.g. URL) stored in a file that is interpretable by a web browser to display the hyperlink as part of a web page.

In contrast, the present invention provides a method that involves a "multilink." The multilink has an appearance similar to a traditional hyperlink, but is associated with a plurality of electronic addresses. Each of the plurality of electronic addresses are included in the parent/source file (e.g. in the HTML coding) that is interpretable to display the multilink.

Additionally, as emphasized in amended claim 1, the multilink provides access to a plurality of distinct files. Accordingly, the single hyperlink/multilink can be used to request many different files, each of which has a corresponding electronic address. The determination of which of those distinct files is delivered to the user is determined in response to a user's selection of an option from a menu of options. The user-selected file is then requested using a corresponding electronic address from the same file that is interpretable to display the multilink. To emphasize, the file that is interpretable to display the multilink/hyperlink is the same file that includes multiple electronic addresses associated with the multilink, and those electronic addresses allow access to multiple distinct/different files, such that all of those different files may be accessed via the single multilink.

Accordingly, by selecting the single hyperlink (multilink) displayed in a browser, a user can then access any one of multiple distinct (different) files. Each of those distinct files has a corresponding electronic address in the parent/source file interpretable to display the multilink, and each of those electronic addresses is associated with the multilink. A selected one of the multiple electronic addresses present at the client device (in the file interpretable to display the multilink), is used to retrieve a desired one of the corresponding files.

In contrast, Kenner discloses that a single hyperlink is usable to access a single file, as is conventional. Files are stored redundantly at multiple delivery sites within the network. Kenner further discloses that a single file may be delivered from any one of several different delivery sites (mirror sites) throughout a network. Although a single file may be delivered via different electronic addresses, only one particular file may be retrieved via a single hyperlink. Kenner provides no disclosure whatsoever of providing access to multiple distinct files via a single hyperlink.

Furthermore, the same, predetermined delivery site is used for all content/files managed by Kenner's system. Any selection of a delivery site occurs automatically and is transparent to the user. Kenner, col 5, lines 36-43; col. 5, line 61 - col. 6, line 1; col. 6, lines 16-30 and 36-39. A user is not making any selection from any menu. Amended claim 1 requires a user's selection of an option from a menu displayed when the user selects a multilink. The user's selection is used to identify which file is to be delivered to the user/client. The user's selection is thereby used to identify which one of the several distinct files that are accessible via the multilink should be delivered to the user/client.

Moreover, Kenner fails to teach or suggest a plurality of electronic addresses that are associated with a single hyperlink, and that are contained in the file interpretable to display the hyperlink. Additionally, Kenner fails to teach or suggest using one of those stored electronic addresses to request a desired file. Instead, Kenner discloses creation of a new electronic address/URL that includes certain information, and using that newly created electronic address to request the desired file. Accordingly, that new electronic address is created on-the-fly, and is not stored in the file interpretable to display a link to the file. Col. 15, lines 19-28.

Therefore, Kenner fails to teach or suggest all claim limitations. Furthermore, there is no motivation in Kenner, or elsewhere, to modify the teachings of Kenner to provide the claimed invention. Further still, any modification of Kenner to store in a file various electronic addresses for use to request a desired file would change the principle of operation of Kenner and/or render Kenner's system/method inoperable for its intended purpose. More specifically, such a modification would prevent the dynamic generation of a URL/request that Kenner uses to make a request that is

optimized for a particular user/client, e.g. to request a file from an "electronically close" delivery site. In other words, such a modification would cause such electronic address information to be fixed and/or identical for all clients/users, and would prevent an electronic address from being custom-generated for a particular client/user, as taught by Kenner.

With respect to claim 5, it is further emphasized that the addresses used to request files associated with the multilink are contained in the file interpretable to display the multilink. In contrast, Kenner discloses that such addresses are generated "on-the-fly."

For at least these reasons, independent claim 1, and dependent claims 3-7, 15 and 16 are patentable. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 3-7, 15 and 16 are requested respectfully.

Claims 8-14

The Examiner's rejection with respect to claims 9 and 10 is unclear. Nevertheless, claims 8 - 14 depend from claim 1 and are likewise patentable.

Claims 17-24 and 33-35

Independent claims 17, 21 and 33 include recitations similar to those of claim 1. In particular, amended claims 17, 21 and 33 clarify that a plurality of distinct files are associated with a single multilink/hyperlink, and that each of the distinct files has a respective electronic address, and that these electronic addresses, which are the addresses that are used to request files, are contained in the file that is interpretable to display the multilink.

The amended claims emphasize features that are neither taught nor suggested by Kenner. More specifically, Kenner discloses a single hyperlink that can be used to access a single file, although that file may be retrieved from various alternative electronic addresses. However, the alternative electronic addresses are not stored in the file interpretable to display the hyperlink. Instead, an appropriate electronic address is created "on-the-fly" in Kenner.

Accordingly, independent claims 17, 21 and 33, and dependent claims 18-20, 22-24, 34 and 35 are patentable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 17-24 and 33-35 are requested respectfully.

Claims 28-32

Independent claims 28 and 30 are directed to a method of operation of a servicing computer. The method includes appending a computer program to a file requested by a client computer. The program is configured for parsing, at the client computer, a multilink URL contained in the file, namely, the file that is interpretable to display a multilink. The multilink URL includes a plurality of electronic addresses, each of which corresponds to a respective one of a plurality of distinct files. The program can parse the multilink URL to generate a menu of user-selectable options responsive to a user's selection of the multilink associated with the multilink URL. Each of the options corresponds to a respective one of the plurality of electronic addresses, and an associated one of the plurality of distinct files.

Accordingly, amended claims 28 and 30 are patentable for reasons similar to those set forth above for claim 1. Claims 29, 31 and 32 depend from independent claims 28 and 30 and are likewise patentable. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 28-32 are requested respectfully.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe claims 1, 3-24 and 28-35 to be patentable and the application in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request issuance of a Notice of Allowance.


Application No. 09/328,607 (Conf. No. 7017)
Reply to Office Action dated December 17, 2003

Docket No. Acharya 3-6-8

If any issues remain, the undersigned requests a telephone interview prior to the issuance of an action.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 11, 2004


Gregory S. Bernabeo
Reg. No. 44,032

Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP
2600 Aramark Tower
1101 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107
Telephone: (215) 923-4466
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189

M:\GBERNABEO\LUCENT\IP22653-A.USA\IPATOFF\REPLY12-17-03.DOC